

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6th February 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: B5480/D/16/3165210

13 Risebridge Road, Gidea Park, Romford, Essex, RM2 5PR.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Sweeney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref: P1347.16, dated 12 August 2016 was refused by notice dated 10th October 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension and insertion of window in flank wall.
-

Procedural Matter

1. Despite the description cited in the header above (which is derived from the planning application forms), I consider a more accurate description of the proposal is two storey and single storey rear extensions and insertion of window in flank wall.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey and single storey rear extensions and insertion of window in flank wall, at 13 Risebridge Road, Gidea Park, Romford, Essex, RM2 5PR, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P1347/16, dated 12 August 2016, subject to the Schedule of Conditions attached to this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The Gidea Park CA comprises a principally residential garden suburb of distinct arts and crafts style properties dating from the early part of the twentieth century. Almost all the houses are detached and appear to have been individually designed to a very high standard. The Gidea Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals (CAA) states that this results in a constant succession of picturesque views involving complex rooflines and massing, many varieties of gable design and a high standard of detailing (para
-

- 4.9). Some of the properties featured in an architectural exhibition at the time of their original inception. The appeal property is one such example and is detailed in *The Book of the Exhibition Houses and Cottages* published in 1911 and titled "*The Hundred Best Houses*".
5. It is of square plan form beneath a hipped roof of red clay tiles rising to an ornamented brick chimney occupying a central position at the roof apex. The walls are finished with cream painted render and the windows are of the casement style. A single storey brick built projection extends across the frontage to the property.
 6. The proposal seeks consent for a two storey rear extension with a rearwards projection of 3 metres. To one side would be a single storey flat roofed extension of the same depth. The two storey addition would occupy just over half the width of the appeal property with the single storey element making up the remaining width across the rear.
 7. The Council are concerned that the proposal would compromise the architectural integrity of the host dwelling due to its height and scale which they say, would visually overwhelm the rear elevation. In this respect, I note that permission was recently granted pursuant to application Ref: P1686.15 for a single storey extension of a similar depth to the appeal proposal, extending across the full width of the rear elevation and it appears the Council's concern rests primarily with the first floor element.
 8. The proposed two storey addition would to some extent weaken the square plan form of the appeal property which is one of its defining characteristics. Nonetheless, sited on the rear elevation in a visually discrete location and with a hipped roof form very much subordinate in scale to the host property, it would leave the original form and identity of the property still readily legible. Its design, scale and massing would appear sensitively composed relative to the host property and I cannot accept that it would visually overwhelm the rear elevation, even in conjunction with the single storey element of the proposals.
 9. Although the Council say that none of the surrounding dwellings incorporate first floor extensions, evidence submitted by the appellant demonstrates otherwise. Details have been submitted of approved extensions at No 5 Risebridge Road just a short distance from the appeal site, as well as Numbers 56 and 58 Parkway which lie a short distance to the South West. These extensions are of completely different design to the appeal scheme, as might be expected due to the different design of those particular houses. Nonetheless, they serve to demonstrate the principle that quite substantial first floor rear extensions have been approved elsewhere on the estate.
 10. I am mindful that the CAA identifies the houses along Risebridge Road as being some of the most architecturally distinguished in the CA and the appellant's reference to the 1911 publication cited earlier, lends further credence to the significance of the appeal property in particular. However, I have found that the proposed extensions are sympathetically designed and would harmonise comfortably with the host property.
 11. Overall on the main issue, I conclude that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the CA, thus preserving its character or appearance. I thus find no conflict with Policies DC61 and DC68 of the Local Development Framework Core

Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) which seek to ensure that development is well designed, respects the scale, height and massing of its physical context and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition for the commencement of development, the Council suggest several conditions. A condition confining the approval to the submitted plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt. A condition requiring details or samples of materials is necessary to secure a satisfactory finish to the development in the interests of the character and appearance of the CA. Conditions withdrawing permitted development rights for the insertion of further windows in the flank walls of the extension and ensuring that the roof of the extension shall not be used as a sitting out area are both necessary in the interests of the privacy of adjoining occupants.

Other Matters

13. Submissions suggest that the proposal would have an unneighbourly impact on the occupiers of No 15 Risebridge Road. However, as the two storey element would be set some distance away from the boundary with that property and subject to the conditions suggested by the Council, I consider their privacy, light and general amenities would not be materially compromised by the proposals.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: 015.15.06: Existing Plans and Elevations. Block Plan; Drawing No: 015.15.07: Proposed Elevations, Plans and Sections.
3. The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further express permission from the Local Planning Authority.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted plans), shall be formed in the flank walls of the extensions hereby permitted, unless further express permission has first been sought and obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
5. Full details or samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, including walling and roofing materials, doors and windows and rainwater goods, shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development.